Application No. Applicant(s) 10/595 603 PETERS, WILLIAM SUTTLE Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit GARY A. PORTER, JR 3766 All Participants: Status of Application: (1) GARY A. PORTER, JR. (3) _____. (2) SEAN SOLBERG. (4) _____. Date of Interview: 25 June 2010 Time: ____ Type of Interview: ▼ Telephonic Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: TYes TNo. If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: n/a Claims discussed: 24-43 Prior art documents discussed: Freed et al. 6.132.363 Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Carl H. Layno/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3766

/GARY A PORTER, JR/ Examiner, Art Unit 3766

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Examiner Initiated Interview Summary

Application No. Paper No. 20100629

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the allowability of Claims 24-43. The Examiner noted that Claims 38-43 contained the limitations discussed in the interview on May 5, 2010 that would overcome the current art rejection (anticipation by Freed). Therefore, the Examiner informed Applicant that claims 38-43 are allowable over the prior art. Applicant subsequently suggested possible dependent claims to be added to the current claim set via an Examiner's amendment. The Examiner reviewed the proposed amendments and found that they had support in the specification. Therefore, these claims have been added via an Examiner's amendment.